

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Balaji et al. (US 2002/0143523).

Response:

The Applicant would like to point out the patentable differences between claim 1 and the combination of Lai and Balaji. Claim 1 recites that the audio player comprises “a character set file stored in the memory, the character set file containing a list of only those characters included in all text files stored in the memory of the audio player”. Since Lai does not teach anything regarding the character set, the Examiner has relied upon Balaji for teaching this limitation.

Balaji teaches a system for providing webpages in multiple languages. As shown in Figure 2 of Balaji, a table is created containing a plurality of languages identified by a language ID, and a plurality of strings identified by a string ID, where the strings are written in each of the supported languages. Balaji teaches a method for displaying text on a webpage in multiple languages according to the language ID associated with a user’s web browser.

Although Balaji teaches that the text file stores only the text strings needed for a particular webpage, this method still requires the client computer to store the complete character set for the language associated with the selected language ID of the web browser. In other words, the client computer that accesses the webpage needs to store the entire character set for the preferred language, and not just the characters that appear on the retrieved webpages.

Therefore, the cited prior art does not teach the claimed limitation of “a character set file stored in the memory, the character set file containing a list of

only those characters included in all text files stored in the memory of the audio player”, as is recited in claim 1. In view of this, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Lai and Balaji.

5 Claims 2, 9, and 11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10 Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Balaji et al. (US 2002/0143523), in further view of Michelson et al. (US 2002/0072047).

Response:

15 Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 3 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

20 Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Balaji et al. (US 2002/0143523), in further view of Holtz et al. (US 2002/0186233).

Response:

25 Claims 4-8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 4-8 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

30 Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (US 2004/0102860) in view of Holtz et al. (US 2002/0186233).

Response:

Claims 23-25 have been cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. Claim 26 recites that the a text calculating circuit calculates a rate at which text is displayed on the display device according to the equation $F=N/T$,
5 where F represents a moving frequency at which text is displayed on the display device, N represents a quantity of text stored in the first text file, and T represents the duration of the first audio file. Claim 26 also specifies that the quantity of text N is selected from a group consisting of N_C , N_S , and N_P , wherein N_C represents a number of characters in the first text file, N_S represents a number of sentences in
10 the first text file, and N_P represents a number of paragraphs in the first text file.


Holtz teaches in paragraph [0135] controlling the scroll rate at which text is displayed, and teaches that the scroll rate is measured in words per minute. However, Holtz does not teach measuring the scroll rate according to the number
15 of characters in a text file. In the rejection of claim 26, the Examiner has implied that the number of characters in a text file is roughly equivalent to the number of words in the text file. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this implication. Not all words have the same number of characters (or letters) in them. With the small size of the display in some audio players, how each character is displayed
20 is important due to the lack of space on the display. Therefore, calculating the text display rate according to the number of characters instead of according to the number of words can influence the performance and usefulness of the text displaying function.

25 For these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 26 is patentable over the combination of Lai and Holtz. Reconsideration of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

30 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/604,746
Amdt. dated November 13, 2007
Reply to Office action of October 03, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 11/13/2007

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)

15